AMATEUR GARDENING AND POPULAR RECREATION IN THE 19TH AND 20TH CENTURIES

Little has been written about the history of popular gardening in Britain. Historians of the garden have been dazzled by the rare and beautiful. Whole forests have been felled to feed the appetite for books describing the history and appearance of the handful of prestigious gardens attached predominantly to the nation's stately homes. Our authors guide us lovingly around the parterres, knot gardens, grottoes, lawns and terraces of Chatsworth, Stourhead, Bodnant, Hampton, and Hidcote. But histories of the garden tend to refer only briefly and usually disparagingly to the vast majority of gardens with which people are most familiar: their own.[1] Likewise historians of leisure have virtually ignored the subject. The growth of popular recreations in the 19th and 20th centuries receives increasing attention, but while we now know a good deal, for example, about the development of spectator sports and working-class holidays by the sea, we have been told little about the evolution of domestic recreations like gardening.[2] It is, however, abundantly clear that by the middle of the 20th century gardening had become a major leisure activity.

Although gardening is a comparatively cheap occupation, at least after the initial purchases of equipment, expenditure is enough to sustain a substantial industry. In 1970 an estimated 100 million pounds a year was being spent on plants, tools and other gardening items, and expenditure was rising by 10% a year in real terms.[3] Judging by the stock carried in most bookshops, publishers are finding a steady market for do-it-yourself gardening manuals. BBC television's Gardening Club began in 1956 and attracted 3½ million viewers in 1963, and Gardeners' Question Time is a highly successful radio programme.[4] In the late 1960s the five principal gardening periodicals sold two million copies, and most national and many local newspapers carry gardening advice columns.[5]

The market for this material is extensive because approximately two-thirds of British homes had gardens in the 1950s and early 1960s, about four-fifths by the end of the decade. By then, we are assured, these 14 million patches of lawn, beds, borders, paths and greenhouses covered about 620,000 acres or an area equal to the former county of Dorset. Lawns alone stretched over 500,000 acres and "their annual mowings involve the cutting of a 12-inch swath three million miles long."[6] In 1950 the digging and pruning, seeding and weeding, sowing and mowing was being done by just under 10 million males and 8½ million females.[7] In 1957 Mass Observation found 23% of gardeners claimed to spend 10 hours a week working in the garden. A government survey in 1969 found that gardening was for men the second most important of all their leisure pursuits (after watching television). It took up on average some 12% of their leisure time, rising to 22% on summer weekdays. It occupied over twice as much time as reading, four times as much as drinking and four times as much as watching sports. For women it ranked fifth in overall importance, as high as any other form of outdoor activity.[8] The General Household Survey of 1977 found that 49% of men and 35% of women in their sample had been gardening some time in the four weeks prior to interview.[9]

In brief, gardening has been a major leisure activity since the Second World War, absorbing much of the time, a lot of energy and some of the income of many millions of people in Britain. It seems worth examining the origins of amateur gardening as a popular leisure activity and attempting to analyze some of the social consequences.

II

Although the number of gardens and amateur gardeners increased considerably in the 19th century, the evidence overwhelmingly shows that as a recreational activity gardening was limited almost exclusively to the rural and urban elites. Since at least the 16th century, the creation and enjoyment of gardens had been a leisure occupation of aristocrat, squire and rural cleric. The novelty of the 19th century, and the explanation of the first increase in public interest in gardens, consists of the emulation of this tradition by the urban middle class.

From early in the century, many of the most wealthy members of the commercial and professional middle class were moving out of the cramped and unhealthy inner city areas of London and the industrial towns of the North and the Midlands. They escaped to new homes in the suburbs. From mid-century, with improvements in transport and increases in their wealth and their numbers, more members of the class imitated them. On the outskirts of London, on the roads leading into Manchester, Leeds, Sheffield, Birmingham and other towns, middle-class estates were laid out and middle-class villas erected.[10] The distinctive feature of these new homes was that they were built with attached private gardens. Plots varied according to wealth and aspirations, upwards from ¼ acre to perhaps 10 acres or more. Houses might be terraced, preferably semi-detached, ideally detached. But whatever the size, here were created scaled-down aristocratic gardens, arcadias suitably distant in space and spirit from the climate of the Victorian city. As *The Gardeners' Chronicle* said in 1841, "Gardens are now an indispensable part of the domestic establishment of every person who can afford the expense."[11]

The comparative novelty of the middle-class suburban gardener was recognized by the editor of a new gardening magazine in 1867:

> It will be our special aim to make it useful to that large and increasing class of the community who, previous to the development of our railway system, lived in cities, but who now live in the country, and who occupy their hours of relaxation from city business in managing, with or without the aid of a common labourer, their suburban garden.[12]

Similarly, in 1870 the editor of *The Villa Gardener* noticed as "one of the remarkable characteristics and social necessities of our well-to-do population, the movement outwards from the turmoil and din of a busy city or town life to the free air of the country and the pretty country villa," and he intended his magazine "for that very large class — the dwellers in Suburban Residences and Villas — who are interested in Gardening simply as a relaxation from other pursuits."[13]

The new urban middle-class enthusiasm for gardening created a large gardening industry in the 19th century. There was a huge increase in the number of nursery businesses, and a more sophisticated advertising and sales system developed.[14] The introduction of new plants from overseas became an industry in itself, expeditions covering the globe in search of "green treasure."[15] The demand for lawn-mowers, glass houses, heating equipment and garden tools was growing, and the number of gardeners employed as domestic servants increased from about

75,000 in 1881 to nearly 120,000 by 1911.[16] Middle-class enthusiasm also lay behind the formation of numerous new horticultural societies, especially in the provinces, and the organisation of horticultural shows.

Such zeal was also responsible for the vast output of gardening publications. The first journal devoted to the entire craft of garden-making and horticultural techniques was *The Gardener's Magazine of Rural and Domestic Improvement*, edited by John Claudius Loudon and published from 1826.[18] *The Horticultural Register* followed from 1831, founded by Joseph Paxton, gardener to the Duke of Devonshire at Chatsworth and later the architect of that great glasshouse, the Crystal Palace. By the late 19th century such magazines were common, but though later titles like *The Garden, Gardening Illustrated* and *Amateur Gardening* appeared as cheap penny weeklies, their style and content continued to reflect a middle-class readership.[19] The same was true of most of the large number of gardening manuals published in the 19th century. Some referred to the needs and interests of rural cottagers and urban mechanics, but the principal market for most works, such as the numerous Beeton's gardening books, was always self-evidently middle-class and upwards. Beeton's *Dictionary of Every-Day Gardening* was offered as a companion to Mrs. Beeton's *Dictionary of Everyday Cookery* since "a knowledge of garden management is as essential to every possessor of a garden as a knowledge of domestic management to every mistress of a house."[20]

In spite of the occasional use of full-time or part-time paid help, it is abundantly clear from the do-it-yourself approach of many publications that most middle-class gardeners worked in their gardens themselves. Gardening was an ideal form of recreation. To a class which placed such emphasis upon hard work, the appropriate use of the leisure their success brought them was a worrying concern. Leisure was too easily associated with idleness, a corrupting vice. In gardening lay a solution: a recreational activity requiring physical effort and some intelligence. These virtues were repeatedly stressed by gardening writers. "The culture of flowers is one of the most delightful and healthful recreations to which man can devote the powers of his mind and body," wrote one in 1857.[21] Gardening was an "elevated and intellectual" activity, wrote another.[22] The editor of one magazine quoted Bacon with approval: "Gardening is the purest of human pleasures, and the greatest refreshment to the spirit of man."[23] Another writer talked of gardening's "health-giving properties, both to body and mind."[24] "As an antidote to lassitude, the martyrdom of indigestion and the worries of everyday work, gardening cannot be excelled," claimed one enthusiast.[25] And another saw comprehensive benefits:

> Moderately indulged in, the occupation is one of the most beneficial recreations known, both for mind and body. The mind insensibly relaxes its nervous tension by contact with the peaceful and regular operations of nature; habits of observation and reflection are induced and fostered, and new and healthy interests are imparted to life.[26]

There was another important virtue in the garden. Although in some respects the urban middle class were emulating their aristocratic rivals by cultivating gardens, there was an important distinction in emphasis. Aristocratic gardens had traditionally been ostentatious displays of wealth and good taste, open to public gaze and exploration. Although the middle class did use the size and appearance of their gardens to demonstrate their wealth and status, they designed their gardens as closed and private preserves. Where possible the garden was surrounded by high walls, and the lawns and house were shielded by shrubberies. Beeton's *Dictionary of Every-Day Gardening* devoted much of a chapter to the need

for seclusion and the methods of securing it.[27] The garden was regarded as an extension of the private house, requiring the same preservation from public gaze. It was in effect a private retreat, garden and house together forming a home environment as distinct as possible from the head of the household's place of work. Within this shelter the Victorian middle class could practice and preserve the domestic values they held dear. In this context can be seen the extra virtue they saw in gardening: like private theatricals, music, games and many of their other recreational activities, gardening was a home-centered occupation, taking place in the sanctuary they had created for themselves. The garden was for the enjoyment of the family and for strengthening attachments to the family. Gardening was, in brief, a "rational recreation" fostering those physical, mental, spiritual and familial values the middle class believed important.[28]

III

By contrast, as historians of leisure have ably shown, much of the popular recreation of the lower orders in the 19th century seemed to the middle class to be debilitating, irrational and degrading, laced with physical violence and heavy drinking. Much of it seemed to imply no special regard for family and home: recreation was usually taken publicly in group or community activities, not as a family concern. The low-grade theatre, music hall or riotous street outing; wakes, fairs and violent sporting activities; and the ubiquitous public house and associated games and gambling dismayed the middle-class observer. Later in the 19th century, spectator sports like football drew working men into more commercialised leisure activities, but again these were outside the home. Of course, some working people were respectably active in chapels or mechanics' institutes and many seemed to regard home as a sanctuary. By the end of the century working-class houses were often decorated by printed mottoes asserting that "East, West, Home's Best" or "Home is the Nest Where All is Best."[29] But in spite of "Home Sweet Home" there was enough evidence to suggest that the public house was a more attractive physical environment and the setting for much of the working man's social life. In general, as Peter Bailey has written, "working-class leisure was for the most part public and gregarious."[30]

Alarmed by working-class behaviour there followed a number of campaigns to control and discipline the working class in their use of leisure, and to encourage the pursuit of "rational recreations." It was in this context that we should see 19th-century attempts to encourage gardening among the urban and rural masses.

A general view was concisely expressed by the editor of *The Gardening World* in 1884: "We hold strongly that gardening is as essential to the welfare, pleasure, and happiness of the poorest as of the richest."[31] Sometimes special emphasis was placed on the economic value to the poor of growing their own food either in gardens or allotments as way of supplementing or perhaps even of justifying low wages.[32] But others took a less strictly utilitarian view. Many observers claimed that building better homes with gardens or allotments for working people would cause their moral regeneration, decreasing drunkenness and pauperism and increasing sobriety, thrift, the homely virtues and contentment. In 1849 the architect C. Bruce Allen argued in *Cottage Building or Hints for Improving the Dwellings of the Labouring Classes* that poor housing exacerbated social tensions and caused intemperance, immorality and crime. To show what might be achieved he quoted from Chadwick's Sanitary Report of 1842: "On entering an improved cottage, with a neat and cultivated garden, in which the leisure hours of the husband are pleasantly and profitably employed, it will be found that he has no desire to frequent the beer-shop, or spend his evenings from home."[33] Likewise,

in *Sybil* Disraeli described with approval Mr. Trafford's attempts to encourage "the domestic virtues" among his work people by building a model industrial village whose characteristics included a garden for each house and a horticultural society.[34] Beeton broke into verse:

> Yes! in the poor man's garden grow
> Far more than herbs and flowers, —
> Kind thoughts, contentment, peace of mind,
> And joy for many hours!

He also argued that "few things are better designed to promote habits of industry and domestic tastes among the working classes than encouragement given to useful and ornamental gardening by means of Cottagers' Horticultural Societies."[35] It is significant that as part of his solution to the problems of Darkest England, General Booth proposed the building of industrial settlements in which each cottage would have "a good garden attached," and Ebenezer Howard saw one of the advantages of Garden Cities to be the provision of alternative recreations to compete with the public house for the favour of the people.[36] The subject was thought to warrant a long editorial in *Amateur Gardening* in 1886:

> If we look about us for the cause of the majority of social evils which afflict society — say, for example, drunkenness, extravagance, general laxity of morals, irreligion — we shall surely discover that the thirst for amusement may be chargeable with by far the largest proportion of all that is wrong in the conduct of individuals, as well as in the various relationships of interests and classes. . . . All that concerns us here to do is to direct the attention of our readers, and especially the philanthropists among them, to the possibility of accomplishing much good among the poorer classes by directing their attention to the beauty of flowers, and inducing them to become possessors and cultivators of pets that will not tempt them to drink, or gamble, or fight, or slander. . . . One of the surest and safest means of improving the labouring population is to provide them with innocent recreations.[37]

One can detect in such expressions of concern for the moral improvement of the working classes another motive for encouraging gardening as a popular recreation. It is no coincidence that such views were often expressed in the 1840s and 1880s at times of political and industrial unrest when working people seemed to many middle-class observers to be threatening the established order. The roots of such political disaffection and of apparent mob violence were often traced to the vicious habits of the ill-educated, poorly-trained, badly-housed masses of the industrial cities. Rational recreations, it was hoped, would eradicate these traits.[38] The working-class gardener would cultivate a concern for domestic life and a respect for property, and this should lead to social harmony and therefore political quiescence. This view was to become a common conservative argument in favour of encouraging homeownership: in 1920 Neville Chamberlain was to write that "every spadeful of manure dug in, every fruit tree planted," converted a potential revolutionary into a citizen.[39]

There were some practical consequences in the 19th century of these pious wishes to foster popular gardening. Local horticultural societies often awarded prizes in a separate class to the efforts of cottagers. Societies were also formed specifically to encourage popular gardening. Quite explicit was the purpose of the Society for Promoting Window Gardening Amongst the Working Classes of Westminster, which arranged flower shows in the 1860s and 1870s. Similarly a curate from, appropriately, Bloomsbury organised an annual exhibition of flowers grown by working-class gardeners in his parish; in 1866, the Earl of Shaftesbury distributed prizes and declared the shows "were a most important contribution to

the moral welfare and educational advancement of the poorer classes." In that year there were exhibitions of window plants from St. Marylebone and East London. "A prize of 1 pound was awarded to St. George's-in-the-East workhouse for a very beautiful fuchsia exhibited by the inmates."[40] Much later Robert Roberts recalled that the Parks Department of Salford Corporation sold pails of "loam" at a penny a time to stimulate an interest in horticulture among the denizens of the "Classic Slum."[41] A few pamphlets for sale or distribution to the poor also appeared over the years, like the *People's Penny Popular Book on Gardening* which among other things described the art of mixing night-soil and earth as a compost, and *Cottage Gardening for the Year* by the Squire's Old Gardener, whose recipe for nourishing window plants was to mix sheep's droppings with rain water.[42]

More constructive attempts to encourage gardening by working people in the 19th century occurred when a handful of philanthropists and paternalistic landowners and employers became concerned about the overcrowded and insanitary houses of the poor and their effects on health and morality. In the 1840s and 1850s some landowners like the Earl of Winchelsea, Marquess of Buckingham and Earl Grey built model cottages on their estates and attached garden plots to them. Other landowners, including the Prince of Wales, followed suit later in the century.[43] Similarly, a few industrial employers built model homes for their workers, also with gardens. For example, the London Lead Company, a Quaker organisation, provided houses with gardens and also allotments in the mining villages they were creating at Middleton-in-Teesdale in 1815 and at Nent Head in 1825, and they encouraged gardening as a recreation by forming horticultural societies, organising shows and offering annual prizes for the best-cultivated plots.[44] Later, in mid-century, a few more companies followed suit, such as Price's Patent Candle Company at Bromborough Pool on the Wirral in 1853. Towards the end of the century when concern about grim urban conditions was increasing, the idea gained more adherents. At Port Sunlight, begun in 1888, Lever in effect provided model rural cottages with sizeable gardens for his industrial workers. This style was adopted in the model villages designed for other housing reformers like Cadbury at Bournville in 1893, for Joseph Rowntree at New Earswick in 1904 and for Ebenezer Howard at Letchworth, the first Garden City, in 1903. Higher quality housing design and construction plus the provision of private gardens were expected to lead to healthier, more contented, more efficient, and more respectable employees and citizens. But the numbers of people catered for in these model environments remained small.[45]

Efforts to encourage gardening among the mass of working people ran up against substantial obstacles. That few working people had the leisure for gardening after a day's work was perhaps the least of them. In the towns, a smoky polluted atmosphere was another discouragement. But the principal problem was the character of most housing development in the 19th century.

Assessing the number of homes which had gardens is a difficult business. We can be sure that there were more of them in agricultural and industrial villages than in towns. Many though by no means all rural cottages had gardens, and allotments were available in some villages. Sometimes these had been acquired in the enclosure movement of the late 18th and early 19th centuries in partial compensation for loss of rights on former commons.[46] The sources suggest not only that gardens were fairly common in rural areas but that some cottagers grew flowers as an enjoyable recreation. Flora Thompson, for example, recalled the "wallflowers and tulips, lavender and sweet williams, and pinks and old-world roses with enchanting names" which grew in a neighbour's garden in the 1880s.[47]

Cottage gardens were reputedly the source of the hardy perennials required by urban middle-class gardeners when the fashion for the wild garden developed in the later 19th century. It was primarily in villages that the cultivation of certain species by working people became a competitive art. Florists' societies were formed early in the 19th century, especially but not exclusively in the industrial villages of the Midlands, and working men, mainly artisans, carefully nurtured their blooms and competed for prizes. This was a highly organised hobby generating its own specialist magazines and books and comprises the clearest evidence of the existence of popular gardening as a recreational activity in the 19th century. But the societies and the florists faded obscurely in the mid-century, perhaps declining as industrial changes damaged the livelihood of their members.[48]

Gardening in the villages was, however, primarily an economic activity, the cultivation of fruit and vegetables mainly for domestic consumption. The fight to obtain large allotments by agricultural labourers in Tysoe is indicative of the economic value of such plots to working people in the countryside.[49] Taine noticed in one village "a pretty large garden filled with vegetables, well-cultivated, garnished with fine strawberries,"[50] and Flora Thompson reported that potatoes and wheat or barley were grown on allotments and vegetables and fruit bushes cultivated in gardens alongside a few flowers.[51] Similarly the allotments and large cottage gardens at Headington Quarry made many families self-sufficient in food, and even where roses were cultivated they were an economic asset sold on Oxford market.[52]

Gardening was, then, a fairly common rural occupation with an economic as well as occasionally recreational character. On the other hand, in the 19th century the population was becoming increasingly an urban one. In 1851 about 54% of the population of England and Wales lived in towns, by 1911 a figure that reached 79%. Moreover, an increasing proportion were living in large towns of over 100,000 people.[53] It is also apparent that urban conditions denied most people the opportunity for gardening.

The type of home occupied by working people in towns varied a good deal according to local circumstances and individual fortune. But throughout the century, wherever in the housing hierarchy the individual lived, he would be fortunate to find himself the possessor of a garden. It is true that in a survey of Birmingham carried out just before the Second World War, one-third of the families visited in the Central Wards, where virtually all the houses had been built before 1914, had gardens of some description.[54] But in most towns these "gardens" would mainly range from window-boxes and tubs of plants in concreted rear yards to the tiny front or rear gardens sometimes attached to superior artisans' dwellings, often those built under the 1875 Public Health Act by-laws. Chapman and Bartlett's study of the plans of 522 hourses built between 1878 and 1884 under by-law regulations in Birmingham showed that 40% had front gardens, but the average size was less than 50 square feet:[55] enough, perhaps, for a few struggling michaelmas daisies and sooty privets to cough out a brief existence. In his first survey of York published in 1901, Rowntree calculated that only 12% of working-class families in the city lived in his class 1 houses. Only some of these had front gardens, and these were small, about 10 or 12 square yards. At the rear there might be a narrow border of earth in the yard, "a sad apology for a garden."[56] Only a fortunate few working-class families had the income and opportunity to live in houses such as those built from 1853 by a Freehold Land Society in Lancaster, many of which had gardens about 100 feet in length.[57] A study of Barrow and Lancaster has shown that quite a high proportion

of workers grew fruit and vegetables on allotments,[58] but it is unlikely that the ratio would be so high in larger towns. In Birmingham before the Second World War even after the passage of the important Allotments Act of 1922, investigators found only 4.6% of householders had allotments.[59]

To make matters worse, 19th-century urbanisation and the pressure for land led to building on many of the garden plots and allotments which working people had formerly cultivated and which had survived in the towns or on their perimeters into the early decades of the century. One observer in Birmingham noted in 1842:

> Within the last half century the town was surrounded by land which was divided into gardens, which were rented by the mechanic at one guinea or half a guinea per annum. Here the mechanic was generally seen after his day's labour spending his evening in a healthy and simple occupation, in which he took great delight. This ground is now for the most part built over, and the mechanics of the town are gradually losing this source of useful and healthy recreation.[60]

A similar complaint was made in Bolton in 1852,[61] while the *Horticultural Magazine* regretfully commenting on the London scene observed:

> Those who look upon the thousands of houses which now cover the space that used to boast of the gaudy tulip-beds of hundreds of working men, would scarcely think it possible to have made so great a change. There are many small gardens, even now, in the Mile End Road . . . which are doomed at no short distance of time to give place to brick and mortar dwellings. . . . Unless something be done to provide the mechanic with means of indulging the practice of Floriculture, he will have recourse to the public-house and the skittle-ground, far less healthy amusements.[62]

In practice, except for the building of a handful of model industrial villages, nothing effective was done in the 19th century to counter the urban obstacles to popular gardening. So long as income was low, land expensive, travel to work by foot or slow transport and government intervention minimal, then a high density of building was inevitable in the towns when industrialisation sucked people to them and population grew. In these circumstances there was little space for gardens or allotments. Attempts to make gardening the "rational recreation" of the urban masses were doomed to failure.

IV

By contrast, social changes in the 20th century effected a huge increase in the popularity of gardening as a recreational activity. Since the radical innovations were concentrated especially into the inter-war years, most attention will be focussed on this period.

For one thing, the 9-hour day which had been standard for most manual workers since the early 1870s was generally reduced to 8 hours in 1919. Earlier finishing on Saturdays also spread. The gain in leisure hours was not outweighed by the increased amount of time some workers wasted travelling to and from work. Furthermore, the introduction of British Summer Time in 1916 was of particular significance since it gave the urban gardener extra time to work outdoors on summer evenings. Further reductions in working hours in the late 1940s consolidated these benefits.[63]

In addition, average real wage earnings were about 30% higher by 1938 than they had been in 1913. Coupled with a fall in family size, the extent of urban poverty was considerably reduced, leaving more families above subsistence level. On the one hand this left more people with more income available for expenditure on recreational activities, including gardening. On the other, it enabled more families for the first time to rent or even in some cases to buy houses with decent-sized gardens. Partly as a consequence of this, the inter-war years are distinguished by an unprecedented amount of house-building.[64]

In the twenty years to 1939, nearly 4 million new houses were built in England and Wales, totalling approximately one-third of the country's housing stock. What is most striking is that the vast majority of these new homes had attached private gardens. Various forces contributed to this end. Faster and yet still cheap public transport — the suburban train, the underground railway, the trolley-bus and the motor-bus — made it possible for more workers to live further from their places of work. As a consequence, more land, and cheaper land, was made available for builders on the perimeters of towns. The pressures previously encouraging high density building were reduced and the opportunity presented for low density building, including the provision of houses with gardens. The realisation of these possibilities was not, however, left entirely to market forces. Between the wars, for the first time, governments attempted to overcome housing shortages and improve housing conditions by financial subsidies and by imposing responsibilities on local authorities. In England and Wales over 1.1 million houses were built by local authorities and 430,000 houses by subsidised private builders.[65]

What is most striking is the style of the houses built by councils and by subsidised and unsubsidised builders. The assumption which dominated public taste and building design until after the Second World War was that estates should be of low density, usually semi-detached houses or short terraces with private gardens to front and rear. On the council estates built by Bristol Corporation between the wars, the housing varied from 6.8 to 10.3 houses per acre, those at York averaged 12 per acre.[66] The alternative concept of blocks of flats and large communal gardens made far less impact on urban development, except in some districts of London, until the 1950s.

The appearance of the houses on the new private and municipal estates shows that they were modelled on Port Sunlight, Bournville, New Earswick and Letchworth. These estates had aroused much public and official interest in the years before the war. The Garden City Association, the National Housing Reform Council and other organisations had campaigned with some effect for improved housing design, town planning and the creation of garden cities and suburbs. By 1914 over fifty garden suburb schemes were completed or in progress. The visual appeal and practical convenience of low density design and estates of houses and private gardens had aroused the aspirations of the house-buying public. As the influx into Hampstead Garden Suburb showed, the wealthy middle class were attracted to the new style, and the lower middle class desired to emulate them. New standards were set which private builders were to follow after the war in the speculative estates of suburbia. More radical, however, was the suggestion that the design should be adopted for new working-class housing. Urban reformers like Howard, Lever, Cadbury and Rowntree argued that the poor housing of the masses led to ill-health, industrial inefficiency, immmorality, and even class conflict. Justice and enlightened self-interest demanded the widespread provision of healthy and attractive homes such as they had built privately on a small scale. Gardens were an integral feature of their ideal homes, perhaps mainly to ensure adequate light and fresh air for the houses, partly to create visually attractive estates, but also to provide occupants with the opportunity for a rational and rewarding recreation.[67] The virtues of the new design had begun to be recognized by officials at the Local Government Board and at the London County Council before 1914, but the new standards received their official blessing with the report in 1918 of the Tudor Walters Committee, set up by the Local Government Board and including among its members Raymond Unwin, the architect of New Earswick and Letchworth. The committee's recommendations on working-class

housing design and construction included a stipulation that housing density should not exceed 12 units per acre. The report and subsequent Local Government Board directives to municipal councils between the wars make it clear that this restriction was primarily intended to make sure that new houses were bathed in adequate sunlight and fresh air and were therefore conducive to good health. But one consequence was that like the pre-war model estates the new homes would have a built-in recreational commitment — a garden.[68]

"A new garden, more often than not, implies a new gardener."[69] Was this contemporary comment accurate? More particularly did the laying out of nearly 4 million new gardens between the wars necessarily make gardening for the first time a common recreational activity at all social levels? Any survey of housing conditions after the Second World War reveals the grim extent to which pre-First World War housing stock persisted. In spite of slum clearance legislation in the 1930s, the worst type of houses still survived though in diminished numbers. Because rents were lower such property attracted many and not just the poorest of the working classes. In 1936, Rowntree found 52.5% of the working-class population of York living in poor type pre-First World War housing and a further 10.7% in slums.[70] Moreover, about 2.5 million of the 4 million houses built between the wars were built by private enterprise normally for sale to a middle-class clientele. In spite of low deposits, low interest rates and substantial improvements in building society services, few working-class people could afford to buy a new home. In York only 3.9% of the working-class population lived in private post-war semis in 1936.[71] Nevertheless the cost of mortgages and rates was sufficiently low to tempt some better-paid workers and a substantial number of the lower middle class. The delights of semi-detached suburbia were not confined to those who had already enjoyed a suburban middle-class existence before the First World War. Furthermore, government subsidies allowed municipal authorities to build and let council houses at uneconomic rents for the first time. It is true that rents remained sufficiently high to deter many of the less well-off, and local authorities in any case often preferred better-paid manual workers and white-collar workers as reliable tenants, but the effect nevertheless was to provide over 1 million families between the wars with new homes on council estates. For the great majority, the use of the attached private garden was a novel experience. We may also assume that these shifts of home ownership allowed some "filtering up" to take place: again it was primarily the upper working class and lower middle class who moved from pre-war garden-less terraces into the superior pre-war houses with gardens in the inner suburbs vacated by those families who had moved to the outer suburbs and the new estates. The effect of this substantial shuffling of the population was undoubtedly to bring the cultivation of a private garden within reach of a large and previously uninitiated section of society, albeit one drawn primarily from the upper working class and lower middle class. This constituted a significant social development, and after the Second World War further rises in real earnings and the building of more municipal and private estates of houses plus gardens sustained the trend.

It is true that not all those who now had gardens were willing gardeners. The attractions of the new home might be the internal lavatory, not the external garden. Moreover, gardens were regarded not solely as places in which to exercise horticultural skills. Cultivation is only one use for a garden. A recent study has shown that many people value gardens as extensions of the house, for storing bicycles, drying clothes, relaxing outdoors. Gardens can serve as safe play areas for children.[72] Furthermore, many of those who now found themselves digging

gardens would have been reluctant to describe their labours as recreation. As photographs show, the newly-built estate whether municipal or private could appear bleak and forbidding: tree-planting, lawn-laying and flower-growing might seem compulsory in an effort to brighten up the environment. Gardens grew willy-nilly, and war with the incipient wilderness fore and aft of the house was perhaps accepted as a necessary evil. On private estates conformity to the neighbourhood's social norms made gardeners of newcomers, but on council estates other forms of compulsion were attempted: at Becontree, as a condition of tenancy, "the tenant shall keep the front garden of the premises in a neat and cultivated condition,"[73] and as a further inducement the London County Council offered annual prizes in a front garden competition on the estate.[74]

Undoubtedly gardens on some estates were neglected,[75] but the evidence of a popular interest in and desire for gardens in the first half of the 20th century is extensive. Whether some nostalgia for a lost rural ideal explains this enthusiasm can be little more than speculation. It is probable that the possession of a garden satisfied the social aspirations of those who desired to emulate the higher social groups who had acquired homes with gardens in the 19th century.[76] In addition, the practical convenience of having open space around the house and the sheer enjoyment which some at least found in gardening should not be underestimated. But perhaps above all, as discussed later, the opportunities presented for indulging in leisure activities at home may explain the increasing demand for the new style house and its attached private garden which investigators found so overwhelming. In a survey of housing in Birmingham conducted just before the Second World War, householders were asked if they valued the possession of a garden: 96.3% of those interviewed who had gardens answered in the affirmative and 78.1% of those without gardens said they would like them. Deeds spoke as loudly as words: the investigators reckoned that of those who had gardens and liked them, 40.9% kept them in good condition, 44.3% in fair condition and only 14.8% left them in a bad state.[77] Similarly, Mass Observation discovered in a wartime survey conducted in London, the South and the Midlands that the great majority of people interviewed wanted gardens: the figures ranged from 79% in a West London borough to 93% in a small Midlands cathedral town. Few people definitely did not want a garden, the highest figure recorded being 10% in a large Midlands industrial town. Inspection of the gardens in the sample showed that 52% were well-kept, 30% of medium standard and only 18% neglected, the highest number of these being attached to 19th-century property.[78] Rowntree observed that in summer the gardens on the council estates of York

> are ablaze with colour. It is indeed amazing how soon families, most of whom had never had a garden before, turn the rough land surrounding their new houses into beautiful gardens. Go where you will in the different estates, everywhere carefully tended gardens meet the eye.[79]

Another sign of the new gardening interest can be traced in the history of garden journalism between the wars. New magazines appeared. Some like *Homes and Gardens* catered for the traditional exclusive middle-class market, often as expensive high quality monthly or quarterly publications. But significantly, some existing magazines modified their appearance and widened their appeal in the inter-war years. The tone of *Amateur Gardening* still inclined to the comfortable middle class, but much of its content consisted of simple do-it-yourself instructions for all amateur gardeners, and by the 1930s it was carrying more advertisements and seeking to attract readers by a coloured front cover. Most

striking was the metamorphosis of *The Gardener*, whose first issue in 1899 had included a gushing appreciation of Sir Alfred Austin's qualities as a gardener, into *Popular Gardening* in 1920, "Full of Bargains and Good Advice," featuring a weekly competition and simple practical guidance for the novice.[80] The new market was most keenly recognised by the editor of *Home Gardening*, "the gardening paper for the millions." His magazine began in 1928 as a bumper, 64 page, 2d weekly, with all the characteristics of the popular press. The front cover was coloured like a comic paper and attached to it was "Free: This Monster Packet of Flower Seeds." There were masses of advertisements, a special offer of *The New Book of Gardening* on approval and terms, a free advice service, a children's column (featuring the adventures of Peter, Pam and Pat), simple instructions for this week's work in the garden and even articles on "Happy Motherhod" and manicuring for "Dainty Finger Tips." Articles were illustrated with photographs, and as the editor said "we shall use no 'high falutin'' language." It was to be

> a *real home-garden paper*, a paper which caters particularly for the needs of those who, not knowing very much — knowing, maybe, nothing at all — about gardening, would yet make their gardens beautiful. There are already thousands upon thousands of such and they are being added to every day. Are there not gardens to most of the new homes on the Council Housing Estates?[81]

There were indeed, and their occupants and others like them kept *Home Gardening* in business until 1940.

Newspaper editors also recognised an increasing popular interest in gardening. A regular gardening column written by F. Hadfield Farthing was published in the *Daily Express* before the First World War and in the 1920s, and this suggests a more widespread interest at least among the lower middle class.[82] The part-work also reappeared between the wars to feed on the new interest: *The New Book of Gardening* in 26 fortnightly parts at 1s 3d a part was published by George Newnes in 1925-26, and the Amalgamated Press produced *The Popular Encyclopaedia of Gardening* in 52 weekly parts at 6d a part in 1933-4. Such publications were probably beyond the means of most working-class families but they were not too expensive for the skilled worker or lower middle-class family, the groups newly involved in gardening.

It was in their direction that many new books were aimed. Gardening books for the middle class were still very common, assuming large gardens and perhaps some paid help,[83] but other works were more classless in their appeal, such as large comprehensive guides and encyclopaedias. Their expense may have limited their market but it would not be outrageous for the keen gardener on a council estate to sink spare cash on a copy of *The Complete Amateur Gardener* 1924, *All About Gardening* 1927, *The Complete Book of Gardening* 1930, *Everyday Gardening* 1931, *The Gardener's Enquire Within* 1934, *The Garden for Expert and Amateur* 1935, or *The Home Gardening Encyclopaedia* 1939. Such works were full of information on every conceivable aspect of gardening, and while articles on rose terraces and conservatory maintenance had a limited interest for the toiler in a 40′ x 30′ council house garden, guidance on digging, pruning and the idiosyncracies of particular plants was of universal value. Writers and editors were aware of the new market for their guides: "Today, especially," wrote one, "when countless new homes and gardens have brought into being thousands of additional gardening enthusiasts, gardening is man's chief hobby,"[84] and another claimed that "the most remarkable development of all is the phenomenal increase in the number of amateur gardeners who are finding a delightful hobby in cultivating the gardens attached to their homes."[85]

As further recognition of the passion for gardening, the BBC broadcast gardening talks by Mrs. Marion Cran in the 1920s and by C.H. Middleton in the 1930s. The number of radio licenses increased from just over 2 million in 1927 to over 9 million by September 1939, by which time there were 73 licenses for every 100 households in the United Kingdom. By this means and in response to the expanding interest in gardening, Mr. Middleton, as he was always known, became a national figure, a true radio personality.[86] He published a series of volumes incorporating many of his talks,[87] and at the same time spanned the media to write a gardening column in the *Daily Express* each Saturday. But perhaps the ultimate accolade to gardening as a popular recreation by the 1930s was the set of 50 cigarette cards illustrating garden flowers issued by W.D. and H.O. Wills.

Before the Second World War gardening had become a popular recreational activity. Tenants on council estates, like rural cottagers, placed more emphasis on growing food in their gardens than the occupants of private estates,[88] but nevertheless it is clear that gardening as an urban recreational activity was no longer confined almost exclusively to the middle class. Although housing conditions still debarred many, particularly working-class people, improvements in the national housing stock by 1939 had opened up opportunities where none had existed before and developments after the Second World War accelerated the process. With only some exaggeration *The Nurseryman and Seedsman* could print with satisfaction on 1 June 1939: "We have been called a nation of shopkeepers; we might with equal justice be called a nation of gardeners."[89]

V

It was argued above that many 19th-century housing reformers, gardening enthusiasts and those landowners and employers who built model villages for their workers believed that the provision of better homes preferably with gardens would not only improve the living standards of the people but by altering their recreational activities would inculcate the domestic virtues and thereby improve the behaviour of the masses. Their influence can be seen in the adoption in the early 20th century of a radical new housing design. But more profoundly it can be traced in the consequent changes in the pattern of popular recreation, just as the reformers had predicted. The new estates consisting of low density houses and attached gardens encouraged the development of home-centred leisure activities.

It is true that in the middle of the 20th century much leisure time was still enjoyed outside the home. There was, for example, an increase after the Second World War in the number of annual holidays taken away from home, usually by the sea, and new forms of commercialised leisure were devised to lure people outdoors, such as greyhound-racing and speedways which began between the wars. Spectators at football and cricket matches remained numerous, although numbers began to fall in the 1950s, as did cinema attendances. The public house remained popular although the frequency of visits and the consumption of alcohol declined considerably from pre-First World War levels.[90]

What is the most striking is the substantial increase in popular home-centred recreations which new housing both imposed and made possible. The revolution in housing design coupled with a reduction in family size gave many families more space and more privacy at home than they had ever enjoyed before. These qualities of home encouraged such domestic activities as model-making. *The Aeromodeller* began as a monthly magazine in 1935, and the start of a popular craze for model railways can be detected in the 1930s, the *Model Railway Constructor* beginning publication in 1934. Similarly, radio construction became a

new hobby, feeding and fed by cheap new do-it-yourself magazines like *Amateur Wireless and Electrics* 1922, *Popular Wireless Weekly* 1922, *The Wireless Constructor* 1924 and *Practical Wireless* 1932. This was in addition to the more passive delights of listening to radio broadcasts, whose appeal in the 1920s and 1930s have been frequently noticed.[91] If we are to judge from the increased sales of popular novels, magazines and newspapers and from the expansion and circulation of lending libraries, reading too was an increasing domestic leisure activity in the first half of the 20th century.[92] In addition the house itself demanded or encouraged the expenditure of leisure time upon it. The temptations were greater for the owner-occupier, but even for the council house tenant do-it-yourself home-making grew in appeal. Furniture-building and home decorating were significantly growing occupations between the wars and after the Second World War, once again encouraging the publication of new magazines, like *Handicrafts* "for the man who likes to make things." Willmott reported this preoccupation on the council estate at Dagenham at the end of the 1950s: "Everybody seems to be a handyman on this estate," said one man. "Down here a man makes an art of having something to do in his home when he gets back from work," said another.[93] It is in this wider context of the growth of home-centred activities that we should see the increasing national preoccupation with gardening. It is appropriate that *The New Illustrated Universal Reference Book*, published cheaply by Odhams in 1933 ("The following pages cover the main interests of humanity"), should include sections on cooking, radio, the home entertainer and the home handyman as well as on gardening.

Alterations in the pattern of recreations and the development of home-centered activities particularly on new housing estates were noticed by social investigators. Ruth Durant stressed the absence of a sense of community and of community activities on the municipal estate at Watling in 1939. The estate was first built in 1927, but "for many people the family had remained the only social group of which they felt themselves to be an integral part." Efforts to create community organisations faltered: "We have gone into our shells," said one resident. Durant concluded: "Thus the majority of men spend their free time exclusively with their family. . . . Nowadays domesticity predominates, most elder people having become absorbed by the claims of their work, their family and their home."[94]

Rowntree also detected a shift in leisure activities. Noticing the substantial reduction in the consumption of alcoholic drink in York between the dates of his first and second surveys, he stressed the importance of the alternative uses of leisure which re-housing was offering. "In 1900 there were scarcely any counter-attractions to the public house. The number of working-class people with really comfortable houses was small, and scarcely any had gardens. Today comfortable houses with gardens may be counted in thousands."[95]

The shift towards a more home-centered society was demonstrated in the comparison conducted by Young and Willmott in 1953-5 between the old-established working-class district of Bethnal Green and the new council estate at "Greenleigh" to which many former residents of Bethnal Green had moved. In place of the strong ties to kin and community where recreational life had centered on the streets and, for men, in the pub, they found a society where external ties were much weaker and the former busy social life diminished. As at Watling, the limited range of shops, pubs and cinemas discouraged recreation outside the home, but the house and garden also seem to have served as positive counter-attractions." The 'home' and the family of marriage become the focus of a man's

life, as of his wife's, far more completely than in the East End." As one resident said: "I'm only interested in my own little family. . . . My life down here is my home." "It's the television most nights and the garden in the summer," said another. "It's not bad here, . . . we've got a decent house with a garden, that's the main thing." As the investigators concluded: "This change from a people-centred to a house-centred existence is one of the fundamental changes resulting from the migration."[96]

Even after forty years of social development, the council estates at Dagenham failed to reproduce the active public social life traditional in 19th-century working-class districts. Instead, Willmott found in the late 1950s and early 1960s a considerable number of residents who placed much value on their gardens, and an even larger number who were keen domestic handymen. He concluded that "the people of Dagenham, when they are not at work, have in the main opted to stay at home."[97]

Recent surveys quantifying the frequency with which people indulge in particular recreational activities or the length of time which they spend upon them, all point to the predominance of home-based leisure forms over other activities and to the importance in particular of gardening. Young and Willmott's study published in 1973 concluded that "nearly all families were home-centred," and if watching television was by then outstandingly the most common use of leisure, then gardening was at least as widespread as any other form of recreation.[98] Similarly, the government's 1969 survey of leisure reveals the attraction of gardening and shows in addition that 52% of the leisure time of men and 57% of the leisure time of women was spent on home-based activities, compared to 38% and 32% respectively spent on external activities.[99]

It is, then, apparent that the re-building of British cities in this century has had a profound effect on the leisure activities of that large section of the population which was involved. These momentous changes can already be discerned in the years between the wars. One consequence was to increase greatly the opportunities for gardening, and this undoubtedly created a gardening revolution in Britain, making it for the first time a popular recreation in the urban areas. But this new leisure pursuit also contributed to the increased home-centredness of families. There were, of course, other factors which encouraged this development when families migrated from densely-packed well-established urban communities to new suburban settlements. However, we should not underestimate the consolidating effect which the opportunities for home-centred leisure activities had on people's lives and social relations. Those 19th-century reformers who sought to remodel people's lives by altering their home environment may have achieved a belated triumph. It is true that the political effects of this change do not seem to have been as substantial as some of them expected and desired. Their hope that the reorientation of working-class life around the home and the family would reduce class antagonisms and induce individualist aspirations, a greater concern for private property and therefore political conservatism, seems to have been frustrated by the nature of Britain's class society. Class allegiances and consequent political loyalties were too strong to be dissolved in the 20th century by higher living standards and better homes.[100] Nevertheless, in other respects the rebuilding of Britain to incorporate the ideal of a house plus private garden for the masses had consequences not only on the uses of leisure but also on the sort of society in which people lived.

University of Lancaster Stephen Constantine

FOOTNOTES

*I am grateful to my colleagues Dr. J.K. Walton and Mr. M.J. Winstanley for helpful comments on an earlier draft of this article.

1. See, for example, E. Hyams, *The English Garden* (London, 1964).

2. See, for example, J. Walvin, *Leisure and Society 1830-1950* (London, 1978).

3. *Woman* 66, no. 1724 (1970), p. 33.

4. J.A.R. Pimlott, "A Nation of Gardeners?," *New Society* 3, no. 82 (1964), p. 19.

5. J.A. Maxtone Graham, "The Big Business of Dig Business," *Reader's Digest* (July 1968), p. 70.

6. *Ibid.*, pp. 67-8.

7. Pimlott, *op.cit.*, p. 18.

8. J.A. Patmore, *Land and Leisure* (Newton Abbot, 1970), pp. 48-52; Government Social Survey, *Planning for Leisure*, 1969, cited in Central Statistical Office, *Social Trends*, no. 1 (London, 1970), p. 78.

9. C.S.O., *Social Trends*, no. 9 (London, 1979), p. 177.

10. J. Burnett, *A Social History of Housing 1815-1970* (Newton Abbot, 1978), pp. 101-7, 187-190.

11. *The Gardener's Chronicle* 1, no. 1 (1841), p. 1.

12. *The Gardener* 1 (867), pp. 1-2.

13. *The Villa Gardener* 1 (1870), pp. i, 5.

14. John Harvey, *Early Nurserymen* (London, 1974); for examples of trade cards and seed packets see John Johnson Collection of Printed Ephemera, Bodleian Library, Horticulture, box 6; for advertisements see gardening magazines especially from c.1880.

15. K. Lemmon, *The Golden Age of Plant Hunters* (London, 1968); T. Whittle, *The Plant Hunters* (London, 1970).

16. G. Taylor, *The Victorian Flower Garden* (London, 1952), chap. IV; P. Horn, *The Rise and Fall of the Victorian Servant* (Dublin, 1975), pp. 71-2.

17. Taylor, *op.cit.*, chap. XIII; J. Johnson collection, *op.cit.*, box 5.

18. The magazine ran until Loudon's death in 1843; see J. Gloag, *Mr. Loudon's England* (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1970), pp. 57-8 and Taylor, *op.cit.*, pp. 177-9.

19. *The Garden* was first published in 1871, *Gardening Illustrated* in 1879 and *Amateur Gardening* in 1884. See also two articles by R.G.C. Desmond on Victorian gardening literature in *Garden History* 5 (1977).

20. Beeton's *Dictionary of Every-Day Gardening* (London, 1874), preface; see also Beeton's *The Book of Garden Management* (London, 1862), and *All About Gardening* (London, 1871) and the many works of J.C. Loudon and his wife especially *The Suburban Gardener and Villa Companion* (London, 1838).

21. *The Garden Manual* (London, 1857), p. 129.

22. *The Gardening World* 1, no. 5 (1884), p. 67.

23. *The Garden Album and Review* 1, No. 1 (1906), "To our readers."

24. John Halsham, *Everyman his own Gardener* (London, 1904), p. 7.

25. F. Hadfield Farthing, *Saturday in my Garden* (London, 1911), p. 18.

26. New Penny Handbook, *Gardening* (London, 1897), p. 9.

27. See also D.J. Olsen, *The Growth of Victorian London* (London, 1976), pp. 215-8.

28. P. Bailey, *Leisure and Class in Victorian England* (London, 1978), pp. 59-60.

29. R. Roberts, *The Classic Slum* (Penguin ed., Harmondsworth, 1973), p. 53.

30. Bailey, *op.cit.*, p. 9; see also R.W. Malcolmson, *Popular Recreations in English Society 1700-1850* (Cambridge, 1973); J. Lowerson and J. Myerscough, *Time to Spare in Victorian England* (Sussex, 1977), p. 58; B. Harrison, *Drink and the Victorians* (London, 1971), chaps. 2 and 14; Walvin, *op.cit.*, pp. 33-40.

31. *The Gardening World* 1, no. 3 (1884), p. 35.

32. D.C. Barnett, "Allotments and the Problem of Rural Poverty 1780-1840" in E.L. Jones and G.E. Mingay (eds), *Land, Labour and Population in the Industrial Revolution* (London, 1967); Beeton's *Dictionary*, pp. 3-5; G. Glenny, *Gardening for the Million* (19th ed., London, 1860), pp. 59-60.

33. C. Bruce Allen, *Rudimentary Treatise on Cottage Building: or Hints for Improving the Dwellings of the Labouring Classes* (3rd ed., London, 1857), p. 12. See also E. Chadwick, *Report on the Sanitary Conditions of the Labouring Population of Great Britain*, 1842, ed. M.W. Flinn (Edinsburgh, 1965), esp. pp. 301, 324-5, 335-6.

34. B. Disraeli, *Sybil or the Two Nations*, 1845, book III, chap. VIII.

35. Beeton's *Garden Management*, chap. 1 and *Dictionary*, p. 88.

36. General Booth, *In Darkest England and the Way Out* (London, 1890), pp. 210-2; E. Howard, *Garden Cities of To-morrow*, 1898, ed. F.J. Osborn (London, 1965), p. 102.

37. *Amateur Gardening* 3, no. 109 (1886), p. 49.

38. G. Stedman Jones, "Working-class Culture and Working-class Politics in London, 1870-1900," *Journal of Social History* 7 (1974), esp. pp. 467-8.

39. K. Feiling, *The Life of Neville Chamberlain* (London, 1946), p. 86.

40. J. Johnson collection, *op.cit.*, box 5.

41. R. Roberts, *A Ragged Schooling* (Manchester, 1976), p. 14.

42. Published in London in 1894 and 1878 respectively.

43. Burnett, *op.cit.*, pp. 47-53, 132-5.

44. A. Raistrick, *Two Centuries of Industrial Welfare, the London (Quaker) Lead Company 1692-1905* (2nd ed., Buxton, 1977), pp. 18, 20, 25, 27-8, 39.

45. Burnett, *op.cit.*, pp. 177-80; W. Ashworth, *The Genesis of Modern British Town Planning* (London, 1954), pp. 119-141; J.N. Tarn, *Working-Class Housing in 19th-Century Britain* (London 1971), chap. 6; G. Darley, *Villages of Vision* (Paladin ed., London, 1978), pp. 130-144.

46. J.D. Chambers and G.E. Mingay, *Agricultural Revolution 1750-1880* (London, 1966), pp. 97-8, 134-5, 187, 191-2; Barnett, *op.cit.*.

47. F. Thompson, *Lark Rise to Candleford* (Penguin ed., Harmondsworth, 1973), p. 78. See also W. Plomer (ed.) *Kilvert's Diary 1870-1879* (London, 1949), entry for 22 July 1871 and M.K. Ashby, *Joseph Ashby of Tysoe* (London, 1974), pp. 41, 109.

48. Taylor, *op.cit.*, chap. VII; for the cult of carnations and chrysanthemums in one village see Ashby, *op.cit.*, pp. 150-1, and for the decline of tulip-growing in Spitalfields as a consequence of the decay of the local silk industry see E.P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (Harmondsworth, 1968), p. 157.

49. Ashby, *op.cit.*, pp. 117, 122-134.

50. H. Taine, *Notes on England*, 1872, quoted in D. Rubinstein (ed.), *Victorian Homes* (Newton Abbot, 1974), p. 228.

51. F. Thompson, *op.cit.*, pp. 62-3, 91. See also *Kilvert's Diary* entry for 26 April 1870.

52. R. Samuel, "Quarry Roughs: Life and Labour in Headington Quarry 1860-1914" in his *Village Life and Labour* (London, 1975), pp. 191-2, 198 and photograph 16. See also *Kilvert's Diary* entry for 2 Feb. 1875.

53. Burnett, *op.cit.*, pp. 138-9.

54. Bournville Village Trust, *When We Build Again* (London, 1941), p. 83 and photographs 25 and 27.

55. S.D. Chapman and J.N. Bartlett, "The Contribution of Building Clubs and Freehold Land Society to Working-Class Housing in Birmingham" in S.D. Chapman (ed.), *The History of Working-Class Housing* (Newton Abbot, 1971), pp. 232-3.

56. B.S. Rowntree, *Poverty, A Study of Town Life* (5th ed., London, 1903), pp. 147-8.

57. J.D. Marshall, "A Village in Lancaster," *Lancaster Comment* nos. 74-76 (1977).

58. E. Roberts, "Working-Class Standards of Living in Barrow and Lancaster, 1890-1914," *Economic History Review* 30 (1977), p. 316.

59. Nine-tenths of these also had gardens, Bournville Village Trust, *op.cit.*, p. 85.

60. Quoted by Chadwick, *op.cit.*, pp. 335-6.

61. Bailey, *op.cit.*, p. 14.

62. Quoted by Taylor, *op.cit.*, p. 112.

63. S. Glynn and J. Oxborrow, *Interwar Britain: a Social and Economic History* (London, 1976), p. 27; A.H. Halsey (ed.), *Trends in British Society since 1900* (London, 1972), p. 120.

64. M. Bowley, *Housing and the State 1918-1944* (London, 1945); H.W. Richardson and D.H. Aldcroft, *Building in the British Economy between the Wars* (London, 1968).

65. *Ibid.* and Burnett, *op.cit.*, pp. 180-183, 221-243; the Housing of the Working Classes Act of 1890, its extension in 1900 and the Housing and Town Planning Act of 1909 empowered but did not compel local authorities to build houses: only a small number were built before 1914, mainly in London.

66. R. Jevons and J. Madge, *Housing Estates* (Bristol, 1946), chap. 3; B.S. Rowntree, *Poverty and Progress* (London, 1941), p. 234.

67. For example see G. Cadbury, *Town Planning* (London 1915), p. ix and chap. VII "Gardens and Allotments"; Darley, *op.cit.*, p. 139.

68. Burnett, *op.cit.*, pp. 218-21; Ashworth, *op.cit.* 191-5; Tarn, *op.cit.*, chaps. 4 and 6; G.E. Cherry, *The Evolution of British Town Planning* (Leighton Buzzard, 1974), pp. 70-1; *Report of the Committee . . . to consider Question of Building Construction*, Cd.9191, 1918.

69. H.H. Thomas, *Gardening in Towns* (London, 1936), p. 2.

70. Rowntree, *Poverty and Progress*, pp. 245, 251.

71. *Ibid.*, p. 226.

72. J. Cook, "Gardens on Housing Estates," *The Town Planning Review* 39 (1968), 217-234; J. Cook, "Do the Gardens Fit the People?", *New Society* 13, no. 342 (1969), 589-591.

73. Becontree Tenants' Handbook, Dec. 1933, appendix 9 to T. Young, *Becontree and Dagenham* (Becontree, 1934).

74. *Ibid.*, p. 106. Similar competitions were organised by the builders of some private estates, A. Jackson, *Semi-Detached London* (London, 1973), p. 211.

75. See Central Housing Advisory Committee, *The Appearance of Housing Estates* (London, 1948), a report to the Ministry of Housing and Local Government.

76. S. Martin Gaskell discusses such aspirations before 1914 in "Housing and the Lower Middle Class, 1870-1914" in G. Crossick (ed.), *The Lower Middle Class in Britain* (London, 1977), pp. 159-183.

77. Bournville Village Trust, *op.cit.*, pp. 84-5.

78. Mass Observation, *People's Homes* (London, 1943), pp. 162, 167.

79. Rowntree, *Poverty and Progress*, p. 234.

80. *Popular Gardening* 21, no. 1096 (1920).

81. *Home Gardening* 1, no. 1 (1928), copy in J. Johnson collection, *op.cit.*, box 7.

82. His articles were published as *Saturday in my Garden* (London, 1911), *The Week-End Gardener* (London, 1914) and *Everyday in my Garden* (London, 1929).

83. For example, Marguerite James, *The Family Garden* (London, 1937) and Sir E.R. Anson, *The Owner Gardener* (London, 1934).

84. J. Coutts, *All About Gardening* (rev. ed., London, 1931), preface.

85. A.J. Macself, *The Gardener's Enquire Within* (London, 1934), p. 11.

86. A. Briggs, *The Birth of Broadcasting* (London 1961), p. 285 and *The Golden Age of Wireless* (London, 1965), pp. 127, 253.

87. *Outlines for a Small Garden* (London, 1934), *Mr. Middleton Talks about Gardening* (London, 1935), *More Gardening Talks* (London, 1936), *With C.H. Middleton in your Garden* (London, 1938), *Mr. Middleton Suggests* (London, 1939).

88. Three times as much according to a 1951 survey cited in G.P. Wibberley, *Agriculture and Urban Growth* (London, 1959), pp. 122-3.

89. Quoting an article by V. Sackville-West in *The New Statesman.*

90. A.M. Carr-Saunders, D.C. Jones and C.A. Moser, *A Survey of Social Conditions in England and Wales* (Oxford, 1958), pp. 245-6, 251-2.

91. For example, Walvin, *op.cit.*, pp. 137-140, 145.

92. Carr-Saunders, Jones and Moser, *op.cit.*, pp. 244-5; Rowntree, *Poverty and Progress*, pp. 376-385.

93. P. Willmott, *The Evolution of a Community* (London, 1963), p. 92.

94. R. Durant, *Watling: A Survey of Social Life on a New Housing Estate* (London, 1939), esp. pp. 27-8, 47, 88-9.

95. Rowntree, *Poverty and Progress*, p. 370.

96. M. Young and P. Willmott, *Family and Kinship in East London*, 1957 (rev. ed., Harmondsworth, 1962), esp. pp. 23, 132, 142-154.

97. Willmott, *op.cit.*, 1963, p. 89.

98. M. Young and P. Willmott, *The Symmetrical Family* (London, 1973), pp. 211-6, 230.

99. Calculated from the table in C.S.O., *Social Trends* , no. 1 (London, 1970), p. 78: 10% and 11% respectively are unclassified. Gardening took up 12% of men's leisure time and 7% of women's.

100. John H. Goldthorpe and David Lockwood, "Affluence and the British Class Structure," *Sociological Review* 11 (1963), pp. 133-163; John H. Goldthorpe *et.al.*, "The Affluent Worker and the Thesis of Embourgeoisement," *Sociology* 1 (1967), 11-31.